

GRAUSTARK

#269. 1970BN, 1971BG, 1971EB, 1971EC, 1971EE, 1971EA, 1972E, 1972G 15 July 1972

1971EE

"Fall 1905"

RUSSIAN TROOPS OVERRUN EAST:

ENGLAND (Trtek): F Por holds; A Yor-Bel; F Nth C A Yor-Bel; F Eng & F Hol S A Yor-Bel; F Lon-Wal; A Kio-Ruh.

FRANCE (Hondry): A Bur-Bel; A Mar holds; F Spa(s.c.) S A Mar.

GERMANY (Tesser): A Gas-Spa; A Mun holds; A Ruh S A Mun; F Bel holds; A Bro-Par.

ITALY (Horton): F Apu-Adr; F Tyr-Nap; F Tun holds; A Tri-Ser; A Ven-Pie.

RUSSIA (P. Wood): A Sil-Mun; A Eer S A Sil-Mun; F Bal S A Ber; A Vic-Tyr; A Bud S ITALIAN A Tri-Ser; A Rum-Bul; F Con S A Rum-Bul.

TURKEY (Drakert): A Ser-Tri; A Gre-Ser; F Bul(s.c.)-Gre; F Ion S F Alb; F Alb & F Eas S F Ion.

Underlined moves are not possible. Germany retreats F Bel-Pio, A Mun-Boh, and Turkey retreats F Bul(s.c.)-Aeg, A Ser-Rum. A player may exercise his option of removing a dislodged piece. These retreats or removals should be sent in with the "Winter 1905" moves, which may be made conditional upon them. The high combatant powers now control the following supply centers:

ENGLAND: Bel, Den, Edi, Hol, Kio, Liv, Lon, Nwy, Par. (9)

FRANCE: Bro, Mar, Spa. (3)

GERMANY: Par. (1)

ITALY: Nap, Rom, Ser, Tri, Tun, Ven. (6)

RUSSIA: Ber, Bud, Bul, Con, Mos, Mun, St. P, Sov, Swc, Vic, War. (11)*

TURKEY: Ank, Gre, Rum, Smy. (4)*

Russia may build 4 units, England may build 2, and Italy may build 1. Germany must remove all but 1 unit. The number of Turkish builds depends on whether Turkey retreated A Ser-Rum, thus acquiring Rumania. In any (continued on p. 3)

1971EB

"Winter 1905"

Following "Fall" moves Russia failed to submit a retreat, and the army dislodged from St. Petersburg is accordingly removed.

ENGLAND (Birsan): Builds F Edi.

FRANCE (Holcombe): Builds A Mar.

AUSTRIA-HUNGARY (Drakert): Builds A Bud.

RUSSIA (O'Neil): No build received.

TURKEY (Hawley): Removes F Smy.

The deadline for "Spring 1906" moves is NOON, SATURDAY 29 JULY 1972. A stand-by set of Russian moves should be sent in by Mark Thomas, 470 Johnston Dr., Watchung, N. J. 07060; 201-755-4458.

1971EC

"Winter 1905"

Following "Fall" moves the following retreats were ordered:

FRANCE: A Eer-Gas.

ENGLAND: F Spa(s.c.)-Wes.

RUSSIA: A Rum-Gal

GERMANY (Berman): Builds A Ber.

ITALY (Warden): Builds F Nap, F Rom.

AUSTRIA-HUNGARY (Bell): Removes A Liv.

The deadline for "Spring 1906" moves is NOON, SATURDAY 29 JULY 1972.

Steve Nozik says that, when writing to him, correspondents should put the words "Cayuga Staff" in the lower right corner of the envelope. Bob Lipton writes that his exact address is Room 511, East Wilson Hall, Justin Morrill College, East Lansing, Mich. 48823. This address will be valid until 10 August; he then returns to his New York address.

POLOPOLIS, LITTLE ITALY (DUNNO): Rumors continue to fly that the inept Herbert Halwit had fled Liechtenstein. All attempts to negotiate a peace failed due to a lack of ability to communicate with Him. And vice versa.

THE SEA WHOSE NAME WE ALL KNOW AND LOVE (Dec. 8, 1905): The Dutch boy was available for comment on the alliance system of war, but no one was available to translate.

RUSSIA WINS WAR - INADVERTENTLY?

Following "Fall 1913" moves, Russia builds F St.P(s.c.) and A Mos, refusing a third build. Turkey builds F Con. Since Russia now has 17 units on the board, to 15 for Turkey and 1 for France, Russia has an absolute majority of all units on the board and is now the winner.

Various rumors from the allied capitals indicated that both intended the war to be a draw. However, the Russian build instructions give Russia a majority of all pieces on the board, and under the 1961 rules according to which this game was played, Russia accordingly is the winner.

A roster and supply center chart will be published in a future issue, along with comments on the game by Walter Buchanan, the winner.

WHEN DO YOU EXPIRE?

With the end of 1970BN, the subscriptions of several players, long since out of the game, have now expired. Below are listed the names of all non-playing subscribers, with the number of the issue with which the subscription expires.

268 - Baileys	270 - Fish	275 - Lindauer	283 - Verheiden
Lasky	Greer	Reilly	286 - Rack
269 - Aita	McMahon	Ricci	288 - Christian
Allen	Stuart	276 - Andrus	291 - Passenheim
H. Anderson	Vagts	Reif	294 - Pandin
D. Johnson	271 - Model	Sorber	296 - Marsland
Koning	Scher	278 - Cressey	299 - Hidalgo
Robt. Miller	272 - Ayers	Leeder	302 - Cohen
Mischel	Just	279 - Kristol	303 - Pearson
Proujansky	273 - Eisen	Richard Miller	308 - Carroll
Salcedo	Monahan	280 - Nelson	309 - Comber
Scholz	Wise	282 - Maloney	322 - Thomas

These data are accurate to Monday 10 July. Subscriptions to GRAUSTARK are 8 issues for \$1.00. This will rise to 6 issues for \$1.00 when the first-class postal rate is raised to 10¢ per ounce. Back issues of GRAUSTARK are available at 10 issues for \$1.00. The following back issues are available: 118-120, 131, 137, 139, 140, 167, 170, 171, 191, 198, 200, 202, 206, 215, 217, 223, 239, 242, 246-250, 252-260, 262-268.

Overseas subscriptions are 5 issues for \$1.00 or 12 for £1.00. Overseas orders for back issues are 10 issues for \$1.00 or 24 for £1.00. Canadian subscribers are requested to remit in Canadian postal money orders payable in American dollars.

1972A

DEADLINE EXTENDED

"Winter 1904"

The Gamesmaster most grievously misprinted the English retreat following "Fall 1904" moves. The fleet dislodged from the North Sea was not removed, but went instead to Holland - which had previously been a German supply center. This meant that England was entitled to two builds, and Germany had to make a removal. Accordingly the deadline for "Winter 1904" moves was extended, and the following builds and removals took place:

ENGLAND (Lipson): Builds F Edi, F Lon. AUSTRIA-HUNGARY (Honig): Builds A Bud.

GERMANY (Huddleston): Removes A Bro. RUSSIA (De Prisco): Builds A St.P.

ITALY (Tretick): Removes F Adr, A Tus.

The deadline for "Spring 1905" moves is extended to NOON, SATURDAY 29 JULY 1972. As before, Michael Stroz should send in stand-by moves for France.

*

"On the trail, the cameleers sing endlessly to their mounts, interspersing these Arab love songs with spirited shouts of 'Zug-Wah-Kif', which is the motto of A Squadron.

"It sounds like a blood-curdling cry of Arab vengeance against ancient wrongs. 'Actually,' confided the captain, 'it's an exhortation to the men to perform their personal sanitation standing up since one of the chaps was bitten by a scorpion in a painful place on a recent patrol.'" - New York Times despatch from the Emirate of Sharja, 9 July 1972

1972E

3

"Winter 1904"

ENGLAND (Abbott): Builds F Lon, F Edi.

GERMANY (Fong): No build received.

ITALY (Ricci): Builds F Nap.

AUSTRIA-HUNGARY (Prosnitz): Builds A Vie.

RUSSIA (Pearson): No retreat was received for the dislodged A War, which is dislodged. Gamesmaster also removes A Liv.

A change in adjudication was sent out to players, since the Turkish move "A Ukr S AUSTRO-HUNGARIAN A Gal-War" had been misprinted as "A Ukr S A Sev-Mos". Accordingly the Austro-Hungarian A Gal-War and the German A Sil-Gal succeed, and Warsaw becomes an Austro-Hungarian rather than a Russian supply center.

The deadline for "Spring 1905" moves is NOON, SATURDAY 29 JULY 1972. Stand-by moves for Germany should be sent in by Payton D. Turpin, 4834 Bram Avenue, Bonita, Calif. 92002.

LONDON (Nov. 11, 1904, Reuters): The Daily Mail today announced that it had despatched its famous international correspondent and former voycur, Seymour T. Watts, to the Reich capital of Berlin. Watts' assignment involves recent rumors that the Kaiser has been kidnapped and is being held incommunicado by foreign agents. Perhaps the Kaiser's recent obscurity is merely and extended vacation, yet there was deep concern in several foreign capitals, notably London and St. Petersburg.

LONDON (Dec. 2, 1904, Reuters): In an effort to bolster sagging circulation, reputedly lost to Punch, the Times today announced the inauguration of the 'Tell a Turk Tale' competition. This contest also has the unofficial blessing of the British government in order to dispel rumors of an Anglo-Turk alliance, allegedly started by a disreputable source in Brooklyn, USA.

The first annual winner's entry is as follows: "Q. What are three X's on a line? A. Two Turks cosigning for an Italian." The Times welcomes all additional entries. Prizes will be hookah pipes and poppy seeds.

1971EE (continued from p. 1)

event the number of Turkish units must be equalized with the number of Turkish supply centers. If the German and Turkish players get those retreat orders in right away, they will be passed on to the other players. The deadline for "Winter 1905" moves is NOON, SATURDAY 29 JULY 1972.

John Richard Trtek wishes to inform the other players that he usually goes as "Dick". Accordingly, they are requested to stop sending him "Dear John" letters.

Press releases, regrettably, are put off to the next issue for lack of space.

THE MINISTRY OF MISCELLANY

Yet another stand-by seems to be needed in 1972G (see p. 4) and so the Gamesmaster calls upon Rod Walker, 4719 Felton, San Diego, Calif. 92116; 714-282-1921. Stand-by moves are needed for Germany. Also in that game, Bob Lipton has a more definite version of his summer address, which appears on p. 1. And, in case there was any doubt, the Italian build reported in this issue is by the new player for Italy, Mike Childers. Childers thus gets into 1972G, having already played in 1971G, 1970G, 1969G, et ad infinitum.

Six pages of letter column crowded out a few press releases this trip, but be assured that they'll see print in the next issue.

For any anti-Communists in the crowd, a complete game of the "Anti-Bolshevik Crusade" version of the Avalon-Hill game Origins of World War II is printed in FREEDONIA #38. A free copy will be sent on request.

"Corrected Spring 1904"

TSAR ORDERS GAMESMASTER TO CONTEMPLATIVE MONASTERY;
GAMESMASTER CASTRATES BOARDMAN'S MOUTH

ENGLAND (Lipson): F Bel-Eng; F Nth S F Bel-Eng; F Iri S F Bel-Eng; F Liv-Nat; A Lon
PRACTICES AMPHIBIOUS MANEUVERS.

FRANCE (Latin): F Eng-Iri; F Mid S F Eng-Iri; A Pic-Bel; A Bur S A Pic-Bel; A Gas S A Bur.

GERMANY (Schleicher): F Den S RUSSIAN F Swe; F Kie-Hol; A Hol-Bel; A Ruh S A Hol-Bel;
A Mun-Bur.

ITALY (Burley): A Ven holds; A Tus S A Ven; F Apu-Adr; F Tyr-Nap.

AUSTRIA-HUNGARY (Berman): A Tyr-Pie; A Tri-Tyr; F Alb-Adr; A Bud-Tri; A Rum S TURKISH
A Arm-Sev.

RUSSIA (Phillips): F Swe S GERMAN F Den; A Liv-War; A Mos & A Ukr S F Sev; F Sev S AUSTRO-
HUNGARIAN A Bud-Rum.

TURKEY (Nierenberg): A Arm-Bul; F Bla C A Arm-Bul; A Gre-Ser; F Aeg-Gre; F Ion S ITALIAN
F Apu-Adr.

Underlined moves are not possible. England retreats F Iri-Liv. Deadline for
"Fall 1904" moves is 6 PM MONDAY 24 JULY 1972.

I knew the precocious Andrew Phillips would SHAAFT me in this game despite the aid of my mentor, Prof. Boardman. But both Boardman and I goofed! I misplaced the Tsar's "Spring 1904" moves, thereby incorrectly indicating no moves were received from him. I also forgot that for the first time in my many years as a Gamesmaster, I am using Miller's Rule in this game and therefore contrary to my previous statement the support of F Iri is not possible and the move should have been underlined. You're right, the Tsar caught the error; ouch!

As indicated in the last issue, Larry Fong is the standby player in this game. But if Prof. Boardman will read my house rules, it is stipulated no country is allowed to stand unordered for two consecutive moves. Tentative moves by standbys are not permitted. If Andy had actually missed his last moves and then again failed to submit moves for "Fall 1904", the usual procedure is to inform the standby and all other players of the new Tsar, and to extend the deadline for three weeks so all players may negotiate with the new player. There are contingencies for extenuating circumstances which may cause a player to be delinquent; for instance, illness. In such circumstances it is within the Gamesmaster's province to extend the deadline to allow a delinquent player additional time to submit moves and continue in the game. Assistant Professor Boardman, one stupid Gamesmaster in a game is sufficient!

1972G

"Winter 1904"

ITALIAN GOVERNMENT RESIGNS

John Devereaux has resigned as Italy, and the first stand-by, Michael Childers, takes over play of that country. His address is in GRAUSTARK #268, and his telephone number is 713-846-9706. The following Russian despatch was addressed to the former government of Italy:

MOSCOW:(Nov. 1904): The Czar today sent a cablegram to the Italian government conveying his appreciation of them as enemies. The cablegram in part stated "with such enemies who needs Allies!" When asked his opinion on the new Italian government he stated "I hope they follow in the footsteps of the previous bunglers. It is obvious that the Italians are lovers and drinkers; they must be for they are not militarist."

Italy builds F Nap. Russia builds A War, and Turkey builds A Smy. No German removals were received, so the Gamesmaster removes A Par & A Gas. The deadline for "Spring 1905" moves is NOON, SATURDAY 29 JULY 1972. See p. 3 for information on stand-bys and address changes.

THE DIPLOMATIC POUCH

[With eight games currently running in GRAUSTARK, it seems that within the limitations of a one-ounce format we cannot catch up simultaneously on both letters and press releases. Since press releases have rather dominated the last few issues, this time it will be the turn of the letters. Dates are indicated where known. Comments of the editor are enclosed in square brackets.]

JIM REILLY, c/o Edward J. Perkins, 3024 Oliver St. NW, Washington, D. C. 20015 [27 May 1972]: I will defer further comment on Nixon's toast [in Shanghai, pledging American military aid to China] because #261 is packed away in a box somewhere, and I don't want to say anything further on the matter until I've had a chance to re-read it. (I still disagree with the conclusions you drew from the toast, however.)

If you have the time, please send me the Goldwater quotes you mentioned. Also, I would be interested in seeing documented proof for your statement: "...George McGovern...has a record of support for the American invasion of Vietnam that's almost as long as the casualty list." Everything I've read up to now has said that McGovern was among the first, if not the first, Senator to speak out against our involvement there. While it is true that he voted for the Gulf of Tonkin resolution, I'm sure that he didn't interpret it the way LBJ eventually did. (It should be noted that Ernest Gruening, one of the two Senators to oppose the resolution, is campaigning for McGovern. Also, I would not be surprised if Wayne Morse has endorsed McGovern as well.)

[Some of these points deal with a letter which I wrote to Reilly on 17 May. I said, "Much of the Republican campaign that year was devoted to explaining that Senator Goldwater really hadn't meant it when he urged an end to Social Security, or a European re-conquest of Africa, or the bombing of China. (I've got references for all three of these statements if you're interested.)"

[Senator Goldwater or, to call him by the title that obviously dominates his outlook on life, General Goldwater, frequently expressed his view that Social Security should be made "voluntary": in a CBS-TV debate with Senator McCarthy on 26 January 1962; in an interview in the Chattanooga Times (3 December 1961); in a TV interview on Continental Classroom (16 March 1962); in U. S. News & World Report (2 September 1963); in the New York Times Magazine (24 November 1963); and in Time (12 June 1964). His plan for a European re-conquest of the former colonies in Africa may be found in his book Why Not Victory? On Issues and Answers, ABC-TV, 24 May 1964, he urged that supply routes in southern China be bombed in pursuit of a blockade policy similar to the one which President Nixon later put into effect. He repeated this suggestion in the New York Times, 27 May 1964, and in Newsweek, 20 July 1964: "If I had my choice, I would go into South China."

[Most of these quotations may be found in Arthur Frommer's Goldwater from A to Z, Pocket Books, 1964.

[Senator McGovern's support for the Vietnam war was detailed in GRAUSTARK #267, pp. 10-11. Those people who know of this support, and who still back him for the presidency, tend to excuse him by saying either, "He was duped into supporting the war" or "At least he's the most anti-war candidate available." It is difficult to see that gullibility qualifies a man for the presidency - and as for his being anti-war, he is by no means the only supporter of the war who now finds it politically expedient to represent himself as a lover of peace. He is running against another such. But see whether he is advocating, in the Middle East, the same policies which got this country bogged down in the Far East.]

I don't think George Wallace "hates" blacks - I think his attitude

toward them roughly parallels that which most people hold for their dogs - you don't hate your dog but you do feel superior to him. I could be wrong on this (you'll probably come up with a few quotes which will trample all over me), but I cannot really believe that Wallace "hates" blacks, because to me "hate" is a very strong word.

[For Wallace's views see his words as quoted in GRAUSTARK #265. But for a few words from a presidential candidate who does hate blacks, how about "Damn Negroes and Puerto Ricans...have no right to teach in our schools." In case you can't figure out where these words came from, the information will be in the next issue.]

I know at least one good reason why you should support McGovern. William Buckley has threatened to move to Australia if McGovern is elected President. Can't you just see Bill talking Latin to the kangaroos?

DOUGLAS REIF, 67 Grosvenor Road, Kenmore, N. Y. 14223 [6 June 1972]: So Mr. Nixon came back from the Soviet Union with the piece of paper that will save the earth, the Arms Limitation Pact. This deal will probably have all the affect [sic] the Washington Naval Conference had; looks great on paper, but does nothing. What dooms the pact to failure is Article VII of the "improvements in existing systems" clause, which reads "Subject to the provisions of this treaty, modernization and replacement of ABM systems or their components may be carried out". Article VII allows the US or the Soviet Union to legally construct a new system around a washer (who says the washer wasn't the system?). The Soviet Union will no doubt do this, and hopefully we will too.

Anyways what good will limiting the size or number of missile systems do? If the purpose is to kill, the missile systems were adequate many years ago. Obviously no one but a lame-brained idiot would order the missiles to be fired, for such an action would be the end to his country. [And we all know, of course, that "lame-brained idiots" never, never come to positions of power in either the United States or the Soviet Union.] The purpose of these missiles is diplomacy, the diplomacy of overkill. Many unaligned nations will seek the shelter of one of the Superpowers at some time or another, and one of the major criteria for their deciding which Superpower is which nation can kill the most people more times over. This philosophy will continue, and Nixon, in all his naivety, believes that since the US and the Soviet Union are equal, their bargaining powers will be equal. But the Soviets, in all their slyness, will continue to research and improve their systems at a fast rate, while we sit on our posteriors, expecting our slight lead to remain. If Congress passes the Arms-Limitations pact, and just lets it sit, we will find ourselves as a weak-sister nation.

[I believe "pitiful helpless giant" is the phrase you want.]

JOHN DE PRISCO, P. O. Box 502, Manor Branch, New Castle, Del. 19720: I have a question concerning the board that you may be able to answer for me.

In the lower right hand corner there is a small space surrounding the game ID block. Does that small space connect Syria with Moscow or Sevastopol? Or maybe Armenia with Moscow?

[No. Every few years some barracks lawyer brings up this question.]

BUDDY TRETICK, 11710 Colstream Drive, Highland Stone, Potomac, Md. 20854 [2 June 1972]: Some of our good friends who play Diplomacy have sent listings of Diplomacy players, their addresses, and their (listed or unlisted) telephone numbers to various JUNK MAIL organizations. Where else would I received junk mail addressed to Buddy Tretick. (The Diplomacy World is the only group that knows me as Buddy Tretick...)

HUGH B. ANDERSON, 2717 Belaire, Lansing, Mich. 48910 [29 May 1972]: In 1970BN, I believe Russia has 18 supply centers, not 17 as reported in GRAUSTARK #265 [following "Fall 1912" moves]. Belgium was omitted. Russia had 16 in "Winter 1911", per GRAUSTARK #262, and took two from England in

"Fall 1912".

[Yes, but in that same move a Turkish army was forced to retreat, and the only available space was into Belgium, until then a Russian supply center. The retreat that gains a supply center is a rare but no unprecedented situation.]

Does this fulfill the new victory criterion, or must Russia actually build the new units?

[This game, 1971BN, was begun under the old rules, and will be completed under them. This means that a win will go to the player who gets an absolute majority of the units on the board, as of the end of a move. For this purpose "Winter" builds and removals count as part of the "Fall" moves. If two players are tied in this respect and are the only players left, a draw will with both their consents be adjudicated as happened in 1965L. But in all other GRAUSTARK games the new rules will be followed. "As soon as one Great Power controls 18 Supply Centers, the player representing that Great Power is the winner. Players may terminate the game by mutual agreement before a winner is determined, in which case all players who still have pieces on the board share equally in a draw."]

...GRAUSTARK #265 was great, especially the article "Archie, Harry, and George".

MARK THOMAS, 470 Johnston Drive, Watchung, N. J. 07060 [13 June 1972]: I am very happy to receive your fine 'zine and would be happy to accept any standby position, no matter how bad. No position is hopeless. Now as to the rest of your comments. I think McGovern spoke to your point on votes in his first "debate" with Humphrey in California. It is, and has been, difficult to get a clear cut, pro or con, Vietnam resolution to the floor of Congress. I've no doubt that if such a vote were held, both McGovern and Humphrey would vote no and Nixon would vote, if he could, yes. The difference between the three is in their perception of the world situation following the collapse of the Thieu government following withdrawal. I believe Nixon thinks that both the Chinese and Russians would feel that they need not continue diplomatic methods to reach their aims and the use of force would become the accepted means of national policy. [In other words, they would be just like the United States.] And this is a danger, no matter what you think. I don't subscribe to the domino theory but I do believe there are situations in which we would be justified in responding to a call of assistance with military force. It's just that Vietnam was, and is, not one of them. McGovern feels, I hope, that the damage to the USA, both internal and external, is too great and overrides these considerations. He is not an isolationist and it is strange that the same people who call for an isolationist government want American business to pressure foreign governments on internal policies.

[You mean American business doesn't do this now?]

As for Humphrey, I believe he has moved from a position identical to Nixon towards McGovern but is caught in the middle, leaving ways open in both directions. He uses the POW's to excuse any continuation of the war. As long as he feels he needs to hold on to a pretext by which he can continue the war, he is not acceptable, to me at least.

As for Wallace, his running mate last time was quoted as recommending "Bomb them back to the Stone Age." [This makes him slightly preferable to politicians who try it without saying so first.]

Your analysis of economics, as depending solely on the war, is sad to say the least. But that's another story.

[Then why did the stock market go into a slump when McGovern won the California primary?]

STEPHEN BELL, 5605 Virgilwood Drive, Greensboro, N. C. 27409 ((27 June 1972)): Thanks for the information about Senator McGovern's record on Indochina...in GRAUSTARK #267. I have one correction to make, however. The attempt to repeal the "Gulf of Tonkin Resolution" was made in 1966, not, as was reported in GRAUSTARK, 1967.

I discovered this error when I read a quote of McGovern's in which he claimed that he voted for the repeal in 1970, the first time it came before the Senate. Since this was in direct contradiction to your statement in GRAUSTARK, I decided to do some research of my own. I went to the public library and waded through all of the Congressional Quarterly of 1967, only to find no votes on the repeal. Then I checked on the year 1966, and sure enough, in that year, Senator McGovern was an opponent of repeal.

((Thanks for correcting my error, and for the research job. Such checking of the record is almost always useful when dealing with a controversy. Many political figures have left on the sands of time footprints which they are later desperately eager to cover up. And as long as the hard coinage of deeds is to be valued over the inflated currency of words, Senator McGovern's efforts to pass himself off as a peace candidate will fail.))

JEREMIAH B. MODEL, 3434 20th Avenue South, Minneapolis, Minn. 55407 ((23 June 1972)): Re: 1970BN. When the game ends, and if you like, I can send you my collected correspondence for that game, bound together in book form (using one of those inexpensive thesis binders.) It might be interesting as a study of how NOT to play Diplomacy.

((Such correspondence, if published, might have the same importance to Diplomacy players that the revelation of diplomatic or military archives might have to historians. However, I presently lack the space in which to publish it. It will either have to wait until a few more GRAUSTARK games are completed, or be published by one of the game's more dedicated archivists.))

You have several times in the past few months had some disparaging things to say about George McGovern. It is, indeed, ridiculous to support him or any other candidate as a 'saviour'. There are no saviours.

But it is equally foolish to put all the prospective candidates into the same basket and damn them all. There are distinct differences. McGovern has said that if elected all American involvement in Indochina will cease in 90 days. Nixon has never said that. Since all we can judge these men on is what they say (since, in the past, they have done pretty much the same things, although this too is arguable), McGovern would seem to be the preferable candidate. At the very least, it makes him the lesser of two evils.

I know this is how Lyndon Johnson got elected. But how could anyone know?

((The same way we know about McGovern -- by examining the record. Fool me once, shame on you -- fool me twice, shame on me.))

One must also consider, too, what I call the secondary effects of a good or bad president: a political 'multiplier', if you will. It is hard to imagine that McGovern would appoint anybody so blatantly fascist and anti-constitutional as John Mitchell. For all the evils of the Johnson years, there never seemed to be a climate of bald repression as there is now. Even HHH would likely appoint people much less antagonistic to civil liberties.

((This is no guarantee. Among the people appointed or re-appointed by that shining knight John F. Kennedy were Dean Rusk, Robert McNamara, J. Edgar Hoover, Allen Dulles, William and McGeorge Bundy, and Walter and Eugene Rostow. As for Humphrey's appointees, he has already indicated that he would have made Arthur Goldberg Chief Justice of the Supreme Court. This court may soon be called upon to decide the legality of the American invasion of Vietnam. We already know how Goldberg stands on that issue, since he often defended the war before the United Nations when he was Ambassador there.))

STEPHEN BELL ((7 June 1972)): When you publish press releases, do you follow the author's words to the letter? I suspect that you do, since Mr. Parents' press releases, as published in GRAUSTARK, show his unique and uncorrected grammar. ((And spelling, and syntax. After all, would you correct the speech of Mister Dooley or Jesse B. Semple, who presumably are now talking across the bar in some literary Valhalla?)) However, I want to be sure before I submit any press releases to you. I am playing in a game in Liaisons Dangereuses, and one time I wrote a press release for the game. Much to my surprise, when that release was published in the next issue of LD, I discovered that Mr. Lakofka had changed some of the words around. The "theme" of the release was not altered,

but some of the humor was lost, and the fact remains that it was no longer my press release, it was Mr. Lakofka's. I haven't submitted a release to Mr. Lakofka or any other gamesmaster since.

((I print all press releases verbatim, though sometimes they get postponed an issue or so, especially if they come in late or coincide with an issue which has a particularly long letter column. There is always a considerable risk in having dealings with the scurrilous Mr. Lakofka, as he showed back when he supported Larry Peery's abortive attempt to take over The Diplomacy Association.))

By the way, what is OPERATION AGITATION?

((This is a codephor for all my publications, and I have been using it for about 10 or 12 years.))

MARK THOMAS ((19 June 1972)): What would 'the same policy in the Middle East' consist of? Is it your conviction that the U. S. is now shoring up a corrupt, collapsing regime in Israel, that has little or no support of its people, as is the situation in Vietnam? I don't think you can equate the NLF with Arab terrorists. Even if you could twist it so, McGovern has said that he wouldn't send in troops in any case. However, I don't want to argue that point much further.

((The internal situations are quite different. "South Viet Nam" is not a nation; it's a business. Israel is most definitely a nation, and its government does indeed enjoy the support of an overwhelming majority of its citizens. But the hazards of getting the United States involved are just as serious - perhaps more serious, since with all the complications of the Vietnamese situation this country does not have a large voting bloc of millions of dedicated Vietnamese. The US government meant well in Vietnam, too. First went the guns and aircraft, together with a few "advisors". This, of course, gave the US a vested interest in seeing that all these loans would be paid back. So more "advisors" went in to protect our "commitment", and then more, and one morning we woke up to realize that we had over half a million troops in Vietnam, that nobody knew how they'd got there, and that nobody knows how to end the mess.

((Start the same sequence over again in another part of the world? No, thanks.))

Your second point, leader following the crowd, McGovern stood against the war in public long before the people moved to that position. Do not let your station in New York lead you to assume that, when you and your friends switched against the war, that this meant the country had moved at the same time. I feel that the anti-war position has just recently achieved a slim and wavering majority in this country. So slim that the recent offensive might have tilted it back, for a time.

((To judge from poll results, and relative turn-outs at pro-war and anti-war parades, as well as politicians' perception that a hard-out Hawk line could no longer be sold, I would estimate that the anti-war position became a majority sometime in late 1967 or early 1968. All McGovern has, that the others don't, is a better Early Warning System for approaching changes in the wind.))

Third point, and I've asked you before, who does meet your very tough qualifications for the Presidency? It's hard to discuss this issue of the Presidency without a handle of a name, a personality that will give me some insight into your thought.

((I am not laying down a standard of orthodoxy and demanding that a candidate adhere to every point. After eight years of war I merely feel that a candidate ought to be anti-war...out of conviction rather than opportunism. The only announced major-party candidate who met that undemanding standard was Shirley Chisholm, for whom I would have voted if she'd had delegates running in this district. Now, I don't know. If any anti-war minor party gets on the ballot in this state I'll vote for it. If not, maybe the tomcod will be biting on election day.))

Fourth point, please do not try and saddle me or McGovern with isolationism. In the world today, it is impossible to isolate ourselves. My point is that we must withdraw our obsolete policy of military dependance. On this, I believe we agree.

((Certainly. But it is scarcely "isolationism" to state that the deterioration of East New York is a more proper subject for American concern than is the shelling of Anloc or Dacca or whatever international headache our government chooses to make a big international deal about.))

JOHN PIGGOTT, 17 Monmouth Rd., Oxford OX1 4TD, England ((25 June 1972)): You mention All in the Family, which we get inflicted on us every Saturday night now. (Nobody

watches it at Jesus College; there are horror movies on Anglia at the same time.) As you probably know, it stems from the British show Till Death Do Us Part, which could not be exported to America because it contained dirty nasty words like "bloody". ((Most Americans are not aware of the great influence that social class has in British speech; they consider "bloody" a general Britishism and regard it as a word that the Archbishop of Canterbury would use in conversation with the Queen.)) AITF is strictly a watered-down substitute, which I feel might account in some way for the reactions to it. Archie Bunker doesn't use foul language - he's strictly a clean-living guy. Okay, so that means he ain't like a real person, but most people who share Archie's views probably like to think of themselves as nice, all-American (what a bleah phrase!) clean-talking blokes, even though they aren't. So they identify with Archie. Now Alf Garnett (the British Bunker) is a different kettle of fish - he swears, his opinions are more extreme than Bunker's, etc., etc. It's my guess that people over here find it more difficult to identify with Garnett than American right-wingers do with Bunker, and I haven't noticed much indication that Garnett has a large following over here of people who agree with him.

I haven't even mentioned the most important difference of all between the two shows, probably, and that is that TDDUP is a damn sight more funny than AITF, even if you understand all the allusions contained in the latter show (and I think I do). You'll forgive me for saying this; maybe it smacks of false national pride but you must admit that American TV is dire compared with ours. No offence meant; it's the sponsorship system for programmes that causes it, I'm sure. ((Most Americans who have considered the matter have come to the same conclusion.)) A show like Monty Python's Flying Circus, for instance, could never have been made in the United States, because no organisation could possibly have been persuaded to sponsor such a wacky show. Over here it could be made since ratings are comparatively unimportant for the government-controlled BBC. It took some time to achieve a following; now it has one of the most faithful audiences of any programme, though of course it's by no means as popular as the mindless crap exemplified by such as Coronation Street or Peyton Place. Bleah.

I hear that the Monty Python film has gone to the States. If you get a chance, go and see it; it's fairly typical of the TV show, consisting (as it does) of sketches from the series. It contains some of the very best of the sketches - and some of the worst. A fair cross-section.

((Among my most treasured possessions are four records containing eight productions of the Goon Show - a BBC radio program of the 1950's which also would never have got off the ground here. However, two of the best are missing, and I hope that someday "The Case of the Booted Gorilla" and "The Dreaded Batter Pudding Mystery" are pressed. The Goon Show has in turn been a major formative influence on a highly popular comedy group of the present time - the Firesign Theater.)

Going back to the swearing on TV bit, there's perhaps hope for you yet. You've got Elizabeth R showing on some stations in the US now, and in the episode I saw last week I caught a glimpse of a bit of naked tit. ((Stay tuned. In the third episode, upon hearing that Queen Elizabeth still wants to see him, the Duke of Alençon kicks a naked girl out of his bed and straight into the TV camera.)) But I hear you've also bought Doctor in Charge, which also contains the word 'bloody' occasionally (at least, I think it's DIC), and I've heard a strange story that the American TV people have bleeped through every bloody. Makes you sick, doesn't it.

In case you're wondering, you should keep the address 'Jesus College' in the GRAU-STARK files. I've just scraped through my first year exams, so that address will be good for another year at least. Jesus College ((Cambridge)), you see, are a damn sight more efficient at forwarding mail than my mother, and as I'm there exactly half the year -

((So - Oxfordshire by birth and Cambridge by education? I suppose I'm an Oxfordshire man myself, albeit 10 generations removed. As near as I can make out, my lineal ancestor emigrated from Claydon, the northernmost parish of Oxfordshire, in 1639 rather than be drafted into the Bishops' War. I've visited the place, and I can see why he left. It's a deadly dull little yellow stone village, with fewer people in it now than it had when Samuel Boreman packed up and left for Massachusetts.))

GEORGE WALLACE IN ORANGE MAKE-UP

Veteran GRAUSTARK readers will remember Derek Nelson, the Toronto Tory, one of the strongest players from the early years of the game. He won the very first of all postal Diplomacy games, 1963A. Later, due in part to his travels, he lapsed from postal Diplomacy fandom, and is now heard from at intervals of many weeks from various interesting corners of Europe.

As a hard-core anti-Communist and by birth an Ulster Protestant, Nelson has expectable opinions on the civil strife presently troubling the British-occupied zone of Ireland. Recently he favored me with some comments on them, including "The trouble with Bloody Sunday is the paratroopers didn't shoot enough of the bastards." Concerning the prospects of a British withdrawal he writes, "If England sells my people out...they'll take care of the Bogside, Andersontown, etc. quickly and efficiently. Anyone who doesn't resist doesn't get shot." As an alternative non-violent solution he suggests cutting off all welfare checks to Catholic districts.

He believes that the ultimate goal of Ulster's Catholics is "a final solution to the Protestant community in Ireland. And don't kid yourself. That's the aim. The extermination of the Protestant community in Ireland, any way they can." He fails to suggest why, in this case, such drastic measures have not been taken with the Protestants of the Irish Republic.

Meantime, another Ulster Protestant has announced what is on his faction's mind. The Village Voice of 29 June 1972 contains an interview with Billy Stewart, vice-president of the Northern Ireland Rifle Association. Stewart, who claims to be "a man of balanced views and balanced opinions", is against the British policy of rounding up and interning suspected nationalists. "When they arrested those men, they should have shot them, not intern them, and this is the only way." He goes on to say, "I can tell you from the bottom of my heart, I wish to Christ Hitler had won the war because Hitler could have made a bloody good Europe. I know you can quote all the atrocities that were carried on, but the lives they took were the lives of people who would not take part in the community. Hitler was faced with the same thing we have today, and that is why he had his so-called gas chambers." Among the Catholic leaders whom he intends to shoot "when his day comes" is Cardinal Conway.

To some Americans the Irish nationalists in Ulster seem strident, over-reactive, and given to purposeless violence. Considering the true character of the Orangemen militants, as here given, the Catholic reaction sounds more reasonable. One great advantage of a system of free speech is that the Stewarts and Nelsons can speak their minds and give us all fair warning of their plans.

THE MINISTRY OF MISCELLANY

George Grayson, who was forced out of 1971EB and 1971EC by the pressure of personal business, writes from a new address: 247 20th Avenue, San Francisco, Calif. 94121. (Telephone 415-668-4982.) He writes that he wants to get back into Diplomacy fandom, and asks that any New York players who get out his way should give him a call.

John Leeder will be away from home and unreachable until 21 August.

*

One player writes "I have always contended that an army which is attacked cannot also hold off a move to another space." This confuses a support order, which can be rendered ineffective by an attack from another space, with a move order. Thus we have the following situations, with underlined moves being impossible:

I. ITALY: A Tyr-Tri; A Ven S A Tyr-Tri.

AUSTRIA-HUNGARY: A Vie-Tri; A Bud S A Vie-Tri; F Adr-Ven.

II. ITALY: A Ven-Tri.

AUSTRIA-HUNGARY: A Vie-Tri; F Adr-Ven.

In the first case, the Italian A Ven must turn and defend itself, leaving the attack A Tyr-Tri without support. In the second case, Trieste is left vacant because of a stand-off; since Venice is not vacant, F Adr cannot enter it.

*

"There will be no white flag if I become President of the United States. I will never permit the United States to become a second-rate power."

Now guess what great big hairy-chested he-man said those ringing words. Theodore Roosevelt? Douglas MacArthur? Henry Jackson? Or maybe Richard Nixon, in his "pitiful helpless giant" speech?

No, chillun, it was Peaceful George McGovern. (New York Post, 7 July 1972) There has been some twitching on Wall Street, you see, about his candidacy, and Peaceful George was just assuring the big boys that his election will do nothing to halt those profitable arms contracts.

Is it altogether coincidental that the western European powers began providing comprehensive social services to their people only after they gave up the dream of Empire? Clement Attlee disassembled the British Empire and drastically raised the standard of living of the British poor. I suppose we dare not hope for such good fortune.

*

War-gaming being what it is, there may soon be a game based on geophysical warfare. for details see my article with this title, in today's issue of GRAUSTARK's sister publication FREEDONIA.

FREEDONIA carries three games of the new Avalon-Hill game Origins of World War II, which applies to the period 1935-40 many of the concepts used on the Diplomacy board. More games are in process of formation with an entry fee of \$3. Subscription rates and frequency of publication are the same as for GRAUSTARK; see p. 2 of this issue to see what those are. This publication is not edited under the supervision of Bangs Leslie Tapscott.

*

"Men who allow their love of power to give them a distorted view of the world are to be found in every asylum: one man will think he is the Governor of the Bank of England, another will think he is the King; and yet another will think he is God. Highly similar delusions, if expressed by educated men in obscure language, lead to professorships of philosophy; and if expressed by emotional men in eloquent language, lead to dictatorships." - Bertrand Russell

*

A convention of the American Ex-Prisoners of War in Portland, Oregon, recently demanded that the US never consider amnesty for draft refugees. (New York Times, 9 July 1972) The bombing of Vietnam was vehemently endorsed. Buried in the fifteenth paragraph of the story was the casual remark, "None of the handful of prisoners who have escaped or been released from Communist prisons in Southeast Asia attended the convention here." Possibly the idea of bombs falling near, or on, their prison camps did not appeal to them.

GRAUSTARK #269

John Boardman
234 East 19th Street
Brooklyn, N. Y. 11226
U. S. A.

FIRST CLASS MAIL

Conrad von Metzke
P. O. Box 8342
San Diego, Calif.
92102

T

IS THERE A RED MARK ON YOUR ADDRESS LABEL?
Or just a number.
See page 2 for the meaning of All This.